REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-16, 18-23, 25, 26, and 29 are pending in the present application; claims 1, 13, 14, and 26 having been amended, and claim 29 having been added by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, each of the pending claims was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) using a combination including at least Whitmarsh (U.S. 2002-0101608) in view of Matsueda, et al. (U.S. 2001-0040692) in Furukawa, et al. (U.S. 2001-0046065). The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to include further features of the invention.

More specifically, the claimed image forming apparatus of Claim 1 includes the additional features of:

hardware resources used for image formation;

applications for performing processes on image formation; and

a platform that exists between the applications and the hardware resources, the platform including an Operating System (OS) and a least one control service to control an execution of each requested processing of the hardware resources according to a function call from at least one of the applications, wherein interprocess communication is performed between the control service and at least one of the applications.

The additions to the claims are supported by Figure 2, for example, in the corresponding description in the specification.

No prior art discloses or suggests a platform that exists between the applications and the hardware resources. The claimed platform includes an Operating System (OS) and at least one control service to control an execution of each requested processing of the hardware resource according to a function call from of at least one of the applications. Further, the

Application No. 10/660,538

Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2009

prior art does not disclose or suggest the claimed combination including the feature of inter

process communication performed between the controlled service and at least one of the

applications.

As the claimed combinations including the additional features are neither disclosed or

suggested by the prior art, each of the prior art rejections is respectfully requested to be

withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 29 are patentable for similar reasons as independent Claim 1 is

patentable.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons the independent claims

from which they depend are patentable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment,

the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable action

to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06)

James J. Kulbaski

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 34,648

11